DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 862 TM 870 386

AUTHOR Fitzgerald, Cyndy T.
TITLE Report on the High Priority Location Stipend Program.
INSTITUTION Dade County Public Schools, Miami, FL. Office of Educational Accountability.
PUB DATE Jul 86
NOTE 36p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Analysis of Variance; Control Groups; Discipline; Elementary Secondary Education; *Incentive Grants; *Labor Turnover; Program Attitudes; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *School Location; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attendance; Teacher Distribution; Teacher Motivation; *Teacher Recruitment; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *Dade County Public Schools FL; High Priority Location Stipend Program

ABSTRACT

The High Priority Location Stipend Program (HPLSP) provides monetary incentives to staff assigned to work at school sites designated as high priority locations. HPLSP was first implemented in the Dade County Public Schools, Florida, during the 1982-83 school year. The purposes of this study were to determine the impact of HPLSP on: (1) staff retention; (2) teaching staff vacancies; and (3) teaching staff attendance. The necessary data were collected from 25 schools which were in the HPLSP program since its beginning and from 25 comparable control schools. The number of students receiving free and reduced lunches, used as a guideline in the selection of high priority locations, was also used for the selection of control schools. Results showed that payment incentive had a positive but short term effect on staff retention and reduced teacher vacancy rates. No significant differences in attendance rates were found between high priority and control schools. The staff considered the program worthwhile. While they suggested a higher stipend, their main concerns were the improvement of working conditions, the reduction of student discipline problems, and the improvement of administrative/teacher relations. Appendices include a list of high priority and control school locations, and copies of three teacher questionnaires. (JAZ)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED283862

# DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

# REPORT ON THE

# HIGH PRIORITY LOCATION PROGRAM

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Turner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS

JULY 1986

TM 870 386



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

Mr. Robert Renick, Chairman
Dr. Kathleen B. Magrath, Vice-Chairman
Mr. G. Holmes Braddock
Mr. Paul Cejas
Dr. Michael Krop
Ms. Janet R. McAliley
Mr. William H. Turner

Dr. Leonard Britton
Superintendent of Schools

# REPORT ON THE
# HIGH PRIORITY LOCATION STIPEND PROGRAM

Principal Author:

Cyndy T. Fitzgerald, Ph.D.

Department of Management Analysis

Dade County Public Schools
Office of Educational Accountability
1450 Northeast Second Avenue
Miami, Florida 33132

July, 1986

The purpose of the present study was to determine the effectiveness of the High Priority Location Stipend Program (HPLSP). The HPLSP involves an incentive payment to staff assigned during the regular school year to work at school sites designated as high priority locations and was first implemented during the 1982-83 school year. To be eligible to receive this stipend, the staff member must:

a. Be a teacher, teacher aide, teacher assistant, resource specialist or security monitor assigned full-time to a high priority location, or be an itinerant art, music, physical education, bilingual or exceptional education classroom teacher or other special teacher assigned at least half-time to one or more high priority locations. (Individuals occupying one of these job positions will be referred to as staff in the balance of this study. When only teachers are involved, they are designated as such.)

b. Hold a valid Florida teaching certificate if required for the assigned position.

c. Receive an acceptable annual evaluation for that regular school year.

d. Be absent no more than five days during the regular school year. For this purpose only, absence is defined as a work day away from the staff's normal work site on a regular workday for sick, personal leave or other reasons. (There are certain types of release time which do not fall under this restriction and they are specified in the UTD contract.)

Stipends vary from $ 500 to $ 2,000 annually depending upon the staff member's position and the number of years that he/she has worked at the high priority location. In addition to the stipend itself, an additional potential benefit of being involved in the program is that a full-time teacher who has qualified for the stipend for three years is eligible to apply for a priority transfer.

The high priority locations that were jointly selected by DCPS and the UTD for the 1982-83 school year are listed in Appendix A. The current DCPS/UTD contract provides that the high priority locations for a given year are to be specified by a committee consisting of three members of the Board and of the Union, no later than April 1 of each year.

Written goals for the high priority location stipend program were not available. However, discussion between staff from the Office of Educational Accountability, the Bureau of Personnel Management and the Office of Legislative and Labor Relations indicated that the program was designed to address the following three specific objectives:

a. To increase the number of instructional and instructional support staff who remain at high priority locations (i.e., to increase retention rates).

b. To increase the number of applicants accepting teaching positions at each of the high priority locations (i.e., to reduce the number of unfilled vacancies).

c. To increase the attendance rates of teaching staff at high priority locations (i.e., to increase the percent of days attended).

It was assumed that the achievement of these three specific objectives would be an indicator of the achievement of the program's global goal which was to improve the quality of staff at high priority locations.

Based on the objectives stated, the specific purposes of the present study were to determine the impact of the High Priority Location Stipend Program on: a) staff retention, b) teaching staff vacancies, and c) teaching staff attendance. In addition, a survey was conducted to provide other information which might be useful for modifying the program and to assess the attitudes that staff have toward the program.

Prior to collecting the relevant staff data, it was necessary to select a control group of schools that would be somewhat comparable to the twenty-five high priority schools that had been continuously involved in the program beginning with the 1982-83 school year. Since the number of students receiving free and reduced lunches was used as a guideline in the initial selection of high priority locations during the 1982-83 school year, the twenty-five schools with the greatest number of students receiving free and reduced lunches which had not already been designated initially in 1982 (or subsequently) as high priority schools were chosen as the control group.[1] These control schools are also listed in Appendix A.

The selection of these twenty-five schools as the control group appears to have been satisfactory since they are not noticeably different from the high priority schools on several variables indicative of school climate. For example, both groups of schools are not statistically different from each other on each of the following variables: the number of students receiving free and reduced lunches, the number of beginning teachers, the number of new teachers, the teachers' number of years of Florida teaching experience, and the percent of teachers with postgraduate education. The means and standard deviations for these variables for the high priority and the control schools during 1984-85 are presented in Table 1.

## Staff Retention: Procedures and Results

### Procedures

The purpose of this portion of the study was to determine if the high priority schools and the control schools had different staff retention rates between Fall, 1981; Fall, 1982; Fall, 1983; Fall, 1984; and Fall, 1985. The first step involved matching a series of computer tape listings of staff members (working at each school in October) from 1981-82 to 1985-86 to obtain the

[1] The number of students receiving free and reduced priced lunches was obtained from the audit of the 1984 economic survey conducted for ECIA, Chapter 1.

number of staff retained at a given school from year to year. Matches were done for 1981-82 to 1982-83; 1982-83 to 1983-84; 1983-84 to 1984-85; and 1984-85 to 1985-86 for each of the schools in this study. The number of retentions for a given year was then converted to a percentage by dividing the number of staff retentions in October of the following year by the total number of staff positions available the prior year.

The data were then analyzed using a repeated measures analysis of variance. The analysis of variance table is presented in Table 2. A table of the means and standard deviations by group for 1982, 1983, 1984, and 1985 are presented in Table 3.

Results

A repeated measures analysis of variance was conducted to determine if there were differences between the high priority and control schools and to determine if retention rates changed over time. The results of the statistical analysis indicated that the differences in staff retention rates between the high priority and control schools were not significant. The results also indicated that there was a significant difference in retention rates over time and that there was a significant interaction between time and whether or not the school was a high priority school. This interaction effect means that the differences in retention rates between the high priority schools and the control schools were not the same for each year. Only the results for the 1982-83 school year yielded a significant difference between groups ($F=7.25$ (1, 47), $p<.01$). These results would seem to indicate that while the program had a positive effect on staff retention the year after it was implemented, this effect was not maintained in subsequent years.

## Teaching Staff Vacancy: Procedures and Results

Procedures

This part of the study was limited to an examination of teaching staff vacancies. A repeated measures analysis of variance was used to determine if the high priority schools and the control schools had a different percentage of teaching staff vacancies between Fall, 1983; Fall, 1984; and Fall, 1985.[2] The first step involved collecting data from the FRO-5 Report (produced for the Budget Office) on the number of teaching staff vacancies for the fifty schools mentioned previously. The number of vacancies was then converted to a percentage by dividing the number of teaching staff vacancies by the total number of teaching positions available at the school.

The analysis of variance table is presented in Table 4. A table of the means and standard deviations by group for 1983, 1984, and 1985 are presented in Table 5.

[2] Data are not currently available for Fall, 1982 since this was the year prior to producing these reports on microfiche.

## Results

The results of the analysis of vacancy rates indicated that the high priority and control groups were significantly different overall. However, the results also indicated that there was a significant interaction between time and whether or not the school was a high priority school. This interaction effect means that the differences in vacancy rates between the high priority and control groups were not the same for each year. In fact, since the vacancy rate dropped the most for the 1984-85 school year, it would appear the program impacted vacancy rates the most one year after its implementation and that this reduced rate was maintained the following year. This may have been due to the fact that not all staff were aware of the program during its first year.

## Teaching Staff Attendance: Procedures and Results

### Procedures

An analysis of variance was conducted to determine if the attendance rates for the high priority schools were different from the control schools. It was not possible to perform a repeated measures analysis on staff attendance since data prior to the implementation of the program was not available in a format conducive to the statistical analyses conducted.

### Results

The analysis of variance on attendance rates was not statistically significant ($F = 2.71$ ($df = 1, 49$) $p > .10$ ). While the average number of days attended for those teaching staff receiving the stipend was slightly higher than for those not receiving the stipend, these differences were not statistically signficant. The means and standard deviations for the attendance rates by group are also presented in Table 1.

## Staff Questionnaires: Procedures and Results

### Procedures

To determine the attitudes that staff have toward the program and to provide information useful for improving the program, three questionnaires were developed by the Office of Educational Accountability after consultation with staff from UTD and DCPS. The three staff groups surveyed were:

A. All staff eligible for the stipend who were working at a high priority location as of October, 1985. This group will be referred to as "Current HPLSP Staff". All of these staff members were surveyed.

B. All staff who worked at a high priority location between October, 1982 and October, 1985, but who were not at a high priority location as of October of the following year. This group will be referred to as "HPLSP Leavers." All of these staff members were surveyed.

C. A 15% sample of potentially eligible staff who have never worked at a high priority location. This group will be referred to as "HPLSP Control."

A separate questionnaire was developed for each of these groups. Appendix B includes the cover memo, the excerpt from the DCPS/UTD contract regarding the program, and the three questionnaires. Staff were given one week to complete and return their questionnaires and were assured that their responses would be anonymous. The survey was conducted the week of June 3rd, 1986.

Results

The distribution of responses for each questionnaire is also presented in Appendix B. In some cases, the mean (X) and standard deviation (SD) is presented. Of those surveyed, the following number of staff responded: Current HPLSP staff (N = 618, return rate = 46%), HPLSP Leavers (N = 135, return rate = 28%), and HPLSP Control (N = 344, return rate = 38%). The results of the surveys are presented separately for each of the groups.

Current HPLSP Staff

The results from the Current HPLSP respondents indicate that about 55% of staff at the high priority locations received the stipend for the 1984-85 school year. (This result is consistent with the statistics previously reported by the Bureau of Personnel Management.) However, unless examined carefully this figure is somewhat misleading. If one subtracts the number of staff that were not eligible for the stipend because they were new staff members, the percent of eligible staff who received the stipend was 67%. Similarly, 66% of eligible staff reported that they had received the stipend for the 1983-84 school year. Only 31% of eligible staff reported that they had received the stipend for the 1982-83 school year, the first year of the program.

The self-report data regarding the reasons why staff did not receive the stipend were fairly consistent for the past two years. Of the 33% of eligible staff who reported that they did not receive the stipend for the 1984-85 school year, 65% said that the reason was due to absence from school. Of the 34% of eligible staff who reported that they did not receive the stipend for the 1983-84 school year, 66% said that the reason was due to absence from school. Of the 69% of the staff who reported that they did not receive the stipend for the 1982-83 school year, only 37% said that the reason was due to absence from school.

Staff who are currently at a high priority location had very positive attitudes about the program. Ninety-two percent of those responding felt that the program is a worthwhile program, ninety-one percent felt that the program should be continued, and eighty-six percent felt that the program is working.

However, when the attitudes of staff regarding the requirements one must meet to receive the stipend were assessed, 54% supported the continuation of the attendance requirement. The majority, 73% supported the continuation of the satisfactory rating by one's supervisor and 68% felt a person should still be

able to receive a high priority location stipend regardless of a subsequent transfer out of a high priority location.

Of the staff that thought the amount of the stipend should be increased, the following average amounts were suggested: First year-$1,132; Second year-$1,912; and Third year-$2,771.

HPLSP Leavers

The response rate from staff who had transferred out of a high priority location was very low. Therefore, results should be interpreted cautiously.

The results indicate that 58% of the HPLSP leavers eligible for the stipend received the stipend for the 1984-85 school year. Similarly, 58% of the eligible staff reported that they had received the stipend for the 1983-84 school year, and 31% of the eligible staff reported that they had received the stipend for the 1982-83 school year.

The self-report data regarding the reasons why eligible staff did not receive the stipend were again fairly consistent. For the 1984-85 school year, the 1983-84 school year, and the 1982-83 school year, all staff reported that they did not receive the stipend because they were absent more than 5 days of school.

Staff who left a high priority location also had very positive attitudes about the program. Eighty-eight percent of those responding felt that the program was a worthwhile program and eighty-eight percent felt that the program should be continued.

However, when the attitudes of HPLSP leavers regarding the requirements one must meet to receive the stipend were assessed, 41% supported the continuation of the attendance requirements. A majority of 71% supported the continuation of the satisfactory rating by one's supervisor and 73% felt that a person should still be able to receive a high priority location stipend regardless of a subsequent transfer out of a high priority location.

Leavers also felt that the amount of the stipend was not enough and should be increased. While only 1.6% indicated that they transferred from a high priority location because the amount of the stipend was not enough, 35.5% said that they would return if the stipend was increased. The three major reasons why leavers transferred out of high priority location were the following: a) the high priority location was too far from home (22.8%), b) the general working conditions were bad (22.7%), and c) the student discipline problems were too great (15.6%).

Leavers said that they would return to a high priority location if general working conditions, student discipline problems, and administrative/teacher relations were improved. All of these responses were ranked by leavers as being more important that an increase in the amount of the stipend.

Control Schools

Staff who have never been at a high priority location also seemed to have positive attitudes about the program. Eighty percent of those responding felt

that the program is a worthwhile program and seventy-four percent felt that the program should be continued.

Staff in the control schools also felt that the requirement of satisfactory ratings by one's supervisor should be continued, that staff should still be able to receive the stipend regardless of a subsequent transfer, that the amount of the stipend should be increased, and that the requirement of good attendance should be discontinued.

Staff in the control schools stated that they would work in a high priority location if the student discipline problems were reduced, if the general working conditions were improved, and if administrative/teacher relations were improved. These changes were all endorsed more strongly than an increase in the amount of the stipend.

## Conclusions

In conclusion, there are some indications that the High Priority Location Stipend Program is working to a limited degree. The results of the statistical analyses that were conducted on the retention data indicated that there was a short term positive effect on staff retention the year after the program was implemented, but that this effect was not maintained in subsequent years. The analyses of vacancy data indicated that the program impacted vacancy rates the most one year after its implementation and that this reduced rate was maintained the following year. The results of analyses of the attendance data indicated no significant differences in attendance rates between high priority and control schools.

The survey results from all of the groups seem to indicate that staff think the program is worthwhile and believe that the program should continue. While staff agree that the amount of the stipend should be increased, this is not perceived as being as important as the improvement of working conditions, the reduction of student discipline problems, and the improvement of administrative/teacher relations.

## Recommendations

The following are a list of the recommendations for the High Priority Location Stipend Program:

1. Continue the program at existing schools but strengthen the program with other changes that are designed to improve working conditions, reduce student discipline problems, and improve administrative/teacher relations. These changes should be implemented only in selected schools so that the impact of the program can be evaluated in a more controlled fashion.

2. If new schools are to be added, the selection of the new schools for participation should be based on the variables the project is designed to impact; i.e., select schools with the highest instructional vacancy rates and lowest retention rates.

3. Re-evaluate the program in 1988-89.

Table 1

Comparison of the High Priority Schools and Control Schools

On Selected Variables

Means and Standard Deviations

| | Group | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | High Priority | | Comparable Sample | |
| Variable Name | Mean | (Std. Dev.) | Mean | (Std. Dev.) |
| Percent Students with Free/Reduced Lunch | 87.71 | (8.38) | 79.98 | (6.18) |
| Number of Beginning Teachers | 0.56 | (0.92) | 1.24 | (1.64) |
| Number of New Teachers | 4.28 | (3.49) | 5.84 | (3.78) |
| Number of Florida years teaching exp. | 8.68 | (2.27) | 9.76 | (1.74) |
| Teachers with Masters or higher (percent) | 38.84 | (9.96) | 42.12 | (9.83) |
| Teacher attendance (percent of days attended) | 96.69 | (0.50) | 96.46 | (0.59) |

Note: Beginning teachers are those teachers who are certifiable, but not yet certified. New teachers are those previously certified teachers that are new to a specific school.

Table 2

Staff Retention

Analysis of Variance Table

| Source | df | Sum of Squares | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Group | 1 | 51.24 | 0.61 |
| Time | 3 | 1103.36 | 6.58** |
| Time * Group | 3 | 449.86 | 7.07** |

** $p < .01$

Table 3

Staff Retention

Means and Standard Deviations

| | Group | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | High Priority | | Comparable Sample | |
| Variable Name | Mean | (Std. Dev.) | Mean | (Std. Dev.) |
| Retention Rate for 1981-82 to 1982-83 | 81.64 | (10.70) | 86.63 | (9.98) |
| Retention Rate for 1982-83 to 1983-84 | 86.73 | (6.15) | 81.50 | (7.35) |
| Retention Rate for 1983-84 to 1984-85 | 77.25 | (9.04) | 80.99 | (8.42) |
| Retention Rate for 1984-85 to 1985-86 | 76.40 | (7.38) | 77.41 | (8.27) |

Table 4

Instructional Vacancies

Analysis of Variance Table

| Source | df | Sum of Squares | F |
|---|---|---|---|
| Group | 1 | 57.66 | 9.35** |
| Subject(Group) | 48 | 400.53 | 1.35 |
| Time | 2 | 20.44 | 1.66 |
| Group * Time | 2 | 49.96 | 4.05* |

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Table 5

Percent of Instructional Staff Vacancies

Means and Standard Deviations

| | Group | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | High Priority | | Comparable Sample | |
| Variable Name | Mean | (Std. Dev.) | Mean | (Std. Dev.) |
| Percent Vacancies for Fall, 1983 | 9.86 | (7.75) | 4.24 | (4.29) |
| Percent Vacancies for Fall, 1984 | 5.72 | (7.15) | 5.49 | (3.79) |
| Percent Vacancies for Fall, 1985 | 6.10 | (3.84) | 5.14 | (3.49) |

Note: The data were collected during October of each fall since this is the time period when the computer files have the highest accuracy level due to the strong emphasis on the first FTE reporting period.

APPENDIX A

List of High Priority Locations and Control School Locations

| High Priority Location | | Control School Location | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Location | Name | Location | Name |
| 5931 | Phyllis Wheatley | 1361 | Douglas |
| 0601 | Buena Vista | 1441 | Dunbar |
| 3021 | Little River | 0081 | Allapattah |
| 3461 | Miramar | 3501 | Morningside |
| 1961 | Floral Heights | 5791 | West Homestead |
| 2941 | A.L. Lewis | 4541 | Rainbow Park |
| 4681 | Riverside | 0521 | Broadmoor |
| 4841 | Santa Clara | 5321 | Southside |
| 1601 | Edison Park | 3301 | Miami Park |
| 1681 | Lillie C. Evans | 0101 | Arcola Lake |
| 2981 | Liberty City | 0481 | J.H. Bright |
| 2761 | Martin Luther King | 0801 | Citrus Grove |
| 4171 | Orchard Villa | 4121 | Opa Locka |
| 1561 | Earlington Heights | 2901 | Leisure City |
| 4461 | Pine Villa | 2161 | Golden Glades |
| 4961 | Shadowlawn | 3181 | Melrose |
| 5561 | Frances S. Tucker | 4301 | Parkview |
| 4401 | Kelsey L. Pharr | 5201 | South Hialeah |
| 2001 | Florida City | 3041 | Lorah Park |
| 2501 | Holmes | 2801 | Lake Stevens |
| 0761 | Feinberg/Fisher | 2621 | J. W. Johnson |
| 5971 | Nathan B. Young | 0461 | Brentwood |
| 4071 | Olinda | 0261 | Bel-Aire |
| 4501 | Poinciana Park | 2361 | Hialeah |
| 3821 | North County | 3621 | Naranja |

APPENDIX B

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

MEMORANDUM

RT-2465
June 3, 1986

TO: Selected Instructional Staff
All Elementary Schools

FROM: Ray Turner, Assistant Superintendent
Office of Educational Accountability

SUBJECT: HIGH PRIORITY LOCATION STIPEND SURVEY

Enclosed is a survey requesting your opinions of the effectiveness of the high priority location stipend program which was first implemented during the 1982-83 school year and is designed to encourage instructional staff to work in high priority locations. An excerpt from the UTD contract regarding the program is enclosed.

Please return the survey in the enclosed addressed envelope through school mail to:

9999, Room 500
Office of Educational Accountability
Attention: Dr. Cyndy Fitzgerald

The survey should be RETURNED NO LATER THAN JUNE 10, 1986.

If you have any questions regarding this survey, contact Dr. Cyndy Fitzgerald at 376-1506.

Your response to this survey will provide the district with important information needed to insure the equality of education for all students.

RT/VR/CTF:de

cc: Elementary Principals
Mrs. Doretha Mingo
Dr. Judith Greene
Mr. Isaac Meares
Mrs. Dorothy W. Adside

Excerpt from July 1, 1985 - June 30, 1988 UTD Contract

Section 11. Incentive Pay Plan (pages 161 - 163)

A. HIGH PRIORITY LOCATION STIPEND - an incentive payment for employees assigned during the regular school year to work at sites designated as High Priority Locations.

1. CRITERIA. To be eligible to receive this stipend, the employee must:

a. Be a teacher, teacher aide, teacher assistant, resource specialist or security monitor assigned full-time to a high priority location, or be an itinerant art, music, physical education, bilingual or exceptional education classroom teacher or other special teacher assigned at least half-time to one or more high priority locations.

b. Hold a valid Florida teaching certificate if required for the assigned position.

c. Receive an acceptable annual evaluation for that regular school year.

d. Be absent no more than five days during the regular school year. For this purpose only, absence is defined as a day away from the employee's normal work site on a regular workday for sick, personal leave or other reasons; for this purpose the following shall not be counted as absences:

- Jury duty
- Subpoenaed witness duty
- Required military physical examination
- Injury-in-line-of-duty
- Illness-in-line-of-duty
- Temporary duty leave (including union pool days)
- Work location closed due to civil disturbance, severe weather or other reasons
- Day contributed to the Sick Leave Bank

2. HIGH PRIORITY LOCATIONS. No later than April 1 of each year, beginning April, 1986, a Committee consisting of three representatives each of the Board and the Union shall designate the High Priority Locations for the following regular school year. The bureau of School Operations will notify the designated locations. The absence of a designation of locations shall constitute automatic redesignation of the previous year's locations.

3. AMOUNT OF STIPEND

a. The amount of stipend an eligible teacher on annual contract receives shall be $500 each year the employee has met the criteria in paragraph 1. above.

b. The amount of stipend an eligible teacher on continuing or professional service contract receives shall be based on the number of years the employee has met the criteria in paragraph 1. above, including any years paid under annual contract status:

| | |
|---|---|
| - First year | $ 500 |
| - Second year* | $1,000 |
| - Third year* | $1,500 |
| - Fourth year* and thereafter* | $2,000 |

*years do not have to be consecutive

c. The amount of stipend an eligible teacher aide, teacher assistant, resource specialist or security monitor receives shall be based on the number of years the employee has met the criteria in paragraph 1. above:

| | |
|---|---|
| - First year | $ 125 |
| - Second year* | $ 250 |
| - Third year* | $ 375 |
| - Fourth year* and thereafter* | $ 500 |

*years do not have to be consecutive

d. For an itinerant teacher, the amount of the stipend stipulated in paragraph 3.a. or 3.b. above shall be pro-rated proportional to the time spent in one or more High Priority Locations.

e. For an employee assigned to a High Priority Location for only a portion of the regular school year, the amount of the stipend stipulated in paragraph 3. a., 3. b. or 3. c. above shall be prorated. However, an employee who leaves a High Priority Location because of resignation, dismissal or voluntary transfer during the school year shall be ineligible to receive the stipend. The stipend will be pro-rated upon promotion or transfer in the best interest of the school district.

4. OTHER PROVISIONS

a. After qualifying for the High Priority Location Stipend for three years a full-time teacher may apply for a priority transfer.

b. An employee who believes the criteria were not correctly applied, or that extraordinary circumstances over which the employee had no control prevented him/her from qualifying for the stipend, may appeal. The appeal shall be in writing within 60 days of the stipend payment date and shall be submitted to Wage and Salary Administration for review and decision by the Associate Superintendent for Personnel Management. A copy of the appeal and the decision will be furnished to the Union.

CURRENT HPLSP STAFF

Dade County Public Schools
High Priority Location Stipend Survey

Your assistance in completing this survey will be appreciated since it will help us to assess the effectiveness of the high priority location stipend. Please provide a response to all questions.

DIRECTIONS
For the items below, answer all responses in the spaces provided. Do NOT write your name on this questionnaire.

1. What is your current school location number?

2. Sex: Mark a "1" for male and a "2" for female.

   Male 16.9% Female 83.1%

3. What grade are you currently teaching? If you are teaching a combination class, mark the grade which contains the highest proportion of your students. If you do not teach a specific grade enter one of the following codes:

   A for Art
   M for Music
   P for Physical Education
   E for Exceptional Education

   | | | | | | |
   |---|---|---|---|---|---|
   | Grade 1 | 20.2% | Grade 2 | 21.2% | Grade 3 | 16.7% |
   | Grade 4 | 19.4% | Grade 5 | 14.0% | Grade 6 | 8.6% |

4. How many consecutive years have you been at your current work location including the 1985-86 school year?

   Mean = 6.2 Standard Deviation = 6.1

5. What is your total number of years of teaching experience in Dade County Public Schools including the 1985-86 school year?

   Mean = 10.5 Standard Deviation = 8.6

6. What is your total number of years of credited teaching experience including the 1985-86 school year? If all of your teaching experience is in Dade County Public Schools, the number would be the same as the number entered in question 5. If you have experience in other school systems, then you should enter the total number of years you were credited with when you entered DCPS plus the total number of years you have in the DCPS system.

   Mean = 13.1 Standard Deviation = 9.1

7. How many days were you absent during the 1984-85 school year?

Mean = 4.8 Standard Deviation = 6.5

8. If you have been at this school for more than one year, did you receive the high priority location stipend for the 1984-85 school year?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 26.9% | 1. | No. |
| 54.6% | 2. | Yes. |
| 18.5% | 3. | I was not at this school for the 1984-85 school year. |

9. If you answered no to Question 8, why didn't you receive the high priority location stipend for the 1984-85 school year?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 28.9% | 1. | I was absent more than 5 school days not including any religious holidays. |
| 4.0% | 2. | I was absent more than 5 school days including religious holidays. |
| 0.0% | 3. | I received an unsatisfactory evaluation. |
| 0.3% | 4. | I was absent more than 5 school days not including any religious holidays, and I received an unsatisfactory evaluation. |
| 0.3% | 5. | I was absent more than 5 school days including religious holidays, and I received an unsatisfactory evaluation. |
| 49.3% | 6. | Not applicable. |
| 17.1% | 7. | Other (please specify)_____ |

_____

10. If you have been at this school for more than two years, did you receive the high priority location stipend for the 1983-84 school year?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 26.1% | 1. | No. |
| 49.8% | 2. | Yes. |
| 24.1% | 3. | I was not at this school for the 1983-84 school year. |

11. If you answered no to Question 10, why didn't you receive the high priority location stipend for the 1983-84 school year?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 29.3% | 1. | I was absent more than 5 school days not including any religious holidays. |
| 4.0% | 2. | I was absent more than 5 school days including religious holidays. |
| 0.7% | 3. | I received an unsatisfactory evaluation. |
| 0.3% | 4. | I was absent more than 5 school days not including any religious holidays, and I received an unsatisfactory evaluation. |
| 0.3% | 5. | I was absent more than 5 school days including religious holidays, and I received an unsatisfactory evaluation. |
| 51.2% | 6. | Not applicable. |
| 14.1% | 7. | Other (please specify)_____ |

_____

12. If you have been at this school for more than three years, did you receive the high priority location stipend for the 1982-83 school year?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 41.9% | 1. | No. |
| 18.9% | 2. | Yes. |
| 39.2% | 3. | I was not at this school for the 1982-83 school year. |

13. If you answered no to Question 12, why didn't you receive the high priority location stipend for the 1982-83 school year?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 18.3% | 1. | I was absent more than 5 school days not including any religious holidays. |
| 1.6% | 2. | I was absent more than 5 school days including religious holidays. |
| 0.3% | 3. | I received an unsatisfactory evaluation. |
| 0.0% | 4. | I was absent more than 5 school days not including any religious holidays, and I received an unsatisfactory evaluation. |
| 0.3% | 5. | I was absent more than 5 school days including religious holidays, and I received an unsatisfactory evaluation. |
| 45.9% | 6. | Not applicable. |
| 33.7% | 7. | Other (please specify)_____ |

_____

14. Do you anticipate receiving the high priority location stipend for the 1985-86 school year?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 25.4% | 1. | No. |
| 74.6% | 2. | Yes. |

DIRECTIONS
Please respond to items 15-19 based on the scale below:

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neither Agree nor Disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

15. The high priority location stipend program is a worthwhile program.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 75.0% | 17.4% | 4.4% | 2.1% | 1.1% |

16. The high priority location stipend program should be discontinued.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.0% | 1.5% | 5.4% | 18.6% | 72.6% |

17. The requirement of good attendance (not missing more than five days) by the staff member in order to receive the location stipend should be discontinued.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 27.0% | 11.7% | 7.7% | 20.7% | 32.9% |

18. The requirement of satisfactory ratings by the staff member's supervisor in order to receive the high priority location stipend should be continued.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 38.8% | 33.9% | 8.8% | 10.1% | 8.3% |

19. A person should still be able to receive the high priority location stipend for the previous year regardless of a subsequent transfer out of a high priority school.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40.6% | 27.1% | 13.7% | 9.5% | 9.1% |

20. The amount of money paid to those involved in the high priority location stipend program is not enough.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 36.2% | 24.0% | 22.2% | 14.1% | 3.4% |

21. The amount of money paid to those involved in the high priority location stipend program is too much.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0.7% | 0.2% | 9.0% | 26.9% | 63.4% |

22. If you answered Strongly Agree or Agree to question 20 or to question 21, what dollar amount do you think that staff should receive for working at a high priority location? If you answered Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree, place the code 9999 in each of the blanks.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Mean = $ 1,132 | A. | First year at a high priority location |
| Mean = $ 1,912 | B. | Second year at a high priority location |
| Mean = $ 2,771 | C. | Third year at a high priority location |

23. Do you think that the high priority location stipend program is working?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 14.2% | 1. | No. |
| 85.8% | 2. | Yes. |

If you answered no, why don't you think the program is working?

_____
_____
_____

If you answered yes, why do you think the program is working?

_____
_____
_____

24. What do you suggest as a substitute for the high priority location stipend if the stipend were to be discontinued?

_____
_____

HPLSP LEAVERS

Dade County Public Schools
High Priority Location Stipend Survey

Your assistance in completing this survey will be appreciated since it will help us to assess the effectiveness of the high priority location stipend. Please provide a response to all questions.

DIRECTIONS
For the items below, answer all responses in the spaces provided. Do NOT write your name on this questionnaire.

1. What is your current school location number?

2. Sex: Mark a "1" for male and a "2" for female.

   Male 19.1% Female 80.9%

3. What grade are you currently teaching? If you are teaching a combination class, mark the grade which contains the highest proportion of students. If you do not teach a specific grade, enter one of the following codes:

   A for Art
   M for Music
   P for Physical Education
   E for Exceptional Education

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade 1 | 17.8% | Grade 2 | 20.5% | Grade 3 | 12.3% |
| Grade 4 | 12.3% | Grade 5 | 23.3% | Grade 6 | 8.2% |
| Grade 7 | 2.7% | Grade 9 | 1.4% | Grade 10 | 1.4% |

4. How many consecutive years have you been at your current work location including the 1985-86 school year?

   Mean = 4.2 Standard Deviation = 4.6

5. What is your total number of years of teaching experience in Dade County Public Schools including the 1985-86 school year?

   Mean = 10.1 Standard Deviation = 7.4

6. What is your total number of years of credited teaching experience including the 1985-86 school year? If all of your teaching experience is in Dade County Public Schools, the number would be the same as the number entered in question 5. If you have experience in other school systems, then you should enter the total number of years you were credited with when you entered DCPS plus the total number of years you have in the DCPS system.

   Mean = 12.4 Standard Deviation = 8.1

7. How many days were you absent during the 1984-85 school year?

Mean = 4.9 Standard Deviation = 4.1

8. If you were at a high priority location for the 1984-85 school year did you receive the high priority location stipend for the 1984-85 school year?

| | |
|---|---|
| 24.2% | 1. No. |
| 33.3% | 2. Yes. |
| 42.4% | 3. I was not at a high priority location for the 1984-85 school year. |

9. If you answered no to Question 8, why didn't you receive the high priority location stipend for the 1984-85 school year? Check all that apply. *

A. I was absent more than 5 school days not including any religious holidays.
B. I was absent more than 5 school days including religious holidays.
C. I received an unsatisfactory evaluation.
D. I received a voluntary transfer.
E. Not applicable.
F. Other (please specify)_____

10. If you were at a high priority location for the 1983-84 school year did you receive the high priority location stipend for the 1983-84 school year?

| | |
|---|---|
| 30.0% | 1. No. |
| 42.3% | 2. Yes. |
| 27.7% | 3. I was not at a high priority location for the 1983-84 school year. |

11. If you answered no to Question 10, why didn't you receive the high priority location stipend for the 1983-84 school year?

A. I was absent more than 5 school days not including any religious holidays.
B. I was absent more than 5 school days including religious holidays.
C. I received an unsatisfactory evaluation.
D. I received a voluntary transfer.
E. Not applicable.
F. Other (please specify)_____

12. If you were at a high priority location for the 1982-83 school year did you receive the high priority location stipend for the 1982-83 school year?

| | |
|---|---|
| 38.7% | 1. No. |
| 17.7% | 2. Yes. |
| 43.5% | 3. I was not at a high priority location for the 1982-83 school year. |

13. If you answered no to Question 12, why didn't you receive the high priority location stipend for the 1982-83 school year?

A. I was absent more than 5 school days not including any religious holidays.
B. I was absent more than 5 school days including religious holidays.
C. I received an unsatisfactory evaluation.
D. I received a voluntary transfer.
E. Not applicable.
F. Other (please specify)_____

Note: An * indicates that the results are presented in the narrative portion of the results section.

DIRECTIONS
Please respond to items 14-20 based on the scale below:

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neither Agree nor Disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

14. The high priority location stipend program is a worthwhile program.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 63.2% | 24.3% | 6.6% | 1.5% | 4.4% |

15. The high priority location stipend program should be discontinued.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.7% | 1.5% | 6.6% | 25.0% | 63.2% |

16. The amount of money paid to those involved in the high priority location stipend program is not enough.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34.8% | 23.0% | 20.0% | 11.1% | 11.1% |

17. The amount of money paid to those involved in the high priority location stipend program is too much.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.9% | 0.0% | 11.8% | 25.0% | 60.3% |

18. The requirement of good attendance (not missing more than five days) by the staff member in order to receive the high priority location stipend should be discontinued.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 33.1% | 14.7% | 11.0% | 16.2% | 25.0% |

19. The requirement of satisfactory ratings by the staff member's supervisor in order to receive the high priority location stipend should be continued.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40.7% | 30.4% | 8.9% | 5.2% | 14.8% |

20. A person should still be able to receive the high priority location stipend for the previous year regardless of a subsequent transfer out of a high priority school.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 44.0% | 29.1% | 10.4% | 5.2% | 11.2% |

DIRECTIONS
For questions 21 to 34, use the following codes:

1. NO
2. YES

21. I transferred from a high priority location by receiving a high priority transfer.

No 86.4% Yes 13.6%

22. I transferred from a high priority location by receiving a voluntary transfer.

No 72.8% Yes 27.2%

23. I transferred from a high priority location because the amount of the stipend was not enough.

No 98.4% Yes 1.6%

24. I transferred from a high priority location because I do not believe that the condition of good attendance in order to receive the stipend should be a factor in deciding who receives the stipend.

No 96.7% Yes 3.3%

25. I transferred from a high priority location because I do not believe that the condition of satisfactory ratings by one's supervisor should be a factor in deciding who receives the incentive.

No 98.4% Yes 1.6%

26. I transferred from a high priority location because the general working conditions were bad.

No 77.3% Yes 22.7%

27. I transferred from a high priority location because the student discipline problems were too great.

No 84.4% Yes 15.6%

28. I transferred from a high priority location because the high priority location was too far from home.

No 77.2% Yes 22.8%

29. I transferred from a high priority location because I wanted to teach students with higher test scores.

No 92.1% Yes 7.9%

30. I transferred from a high priority location because of the poor administrative/teacher relations.

No 84.4% Yes 15.6%

31. I would return to a high priority location if the amount of the stipend were increased.

No 64.5% Yes 35.5%

32. I would return to a high priority location if the condition of good attendance was not a factor in determining who received the incentive.

No 71.2% Yes 28.8%

33. I would return to a high priority location if the condition of satisfactory ratings by one's supervisor was not a factor in determining who received the incentive.

No 81.1% Yes 18.9%

34. I would return to a high priority location if the general working conditions were improved.

No 49.1% Yes 50.9%

35. I would <u>return</u> to a high priority location if the student discipline problems were reduced.

No 54.5% Yes 45.5%

36. I would <u>return</u> to a high priority location if I could teach students with higher test scores.

No 78.0% Yes 22.0%

37. I would <u>return</u> to a high priority location if administrative/teacher relations were improved.

No 56.4% Yes 43.6%

HPLSP CONTROL

Dade County Public Schools
High Priority Location Stipend Survey

Your assistance in completing this survey will be appreciated since it will help us to assess the effectiveness of the high priority location stipend. Please provide a response to all questions.

DIRECTIONS
For the items below, answer all responses in the spaces provided. Do NOT write your name on this questionnaire.

1. What is your current school location number?

2. Sex: Mark a "1" for male and a "2" for female.

   Male 13.9% Female 86.1%

3. What grade are you currently teaching? If you are teaching a combination class, mark the grade which contains the highest proportion of students. If you do not teach a specific grade, enter one of the following codes:

   A for Art
   M for Music
   P for Physical Education
   E for Exceptional Education

   | | | | | | |
   |---|---|---|---|---|---|
   | Grade 1 | 17.2% | Grade 2 | 18.6% | Grade 3 | 18.6% |
   | Grade 4 | 17.2% | Grade 5 | 14.9% | Grade 6 | 13.5% |

4. How many consecutive years have you been at your current work location including the 1985-86 school year?

   Mean = 8.4 Standard Deviation = 6.6

5. What is your total number of years of teaching experience in Dade County Public Schools including the 1985-86 school year?

   Mean = 13.6 Standard Deviation = 8.2

6. What is your total number of years of credited teaching experience including the 1985-86 school year? If all of your teaching experience is in Dade County Public Schools, the number would be the same as the number entered in question 5. If you have experience in other school systems, then you should enter the total number of years you were credited with when you entered DCPS plus the total number of years you have in the DCPS system.

   Mean = 15.7 Standard Deviation = 8.5

DIRECTIONS
Please respond to items 7-14 based on the scale below:

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neither Agree nor Disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

7. The high priority location stipend program is a worthwhile program.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 42.9% | 37.4% | 14.3% | 3.7% | 1.7% |

8. The high priority location stipend program should be discontinued.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.6% | 4.3% | 18.9% | 34.6% | 39.7% |

9. The amount of money paid to those involved in the high priority location stipend program is too much.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.1% | 3.7% | 14.8% | 40.9% | 37.5% |

10. The amount of money paid to those involved in the high priority location stipend program is not enough.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26.2% | 24.8% | 26.5% | 15.7% | 6.8% |

11. The amount of money paid to those involved in the high priority location stipend program should be more.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25.6% | 27.9% | 25.1% | 16.0% | 5.4% |

12. The requirement of good attendance (not missing more than five days) by the staff member in order to receive the high priority location stipend should be discontinued.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21.9% | 24.5% | 13.1% | 18.8% | 21.7% |

13. The requirement of satisfactory ratings by the staff member's supervisor in order to receive the high priority location stipend should be continued.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34.1% | 39.5% | 8.8% | 9.1% | 8.5% |

14. A person should still be able to receive the high priority location stipend for the previous year regardless of a subsequent transfer out of a high priority school.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26.3% | 36.6% | 14.0% | 11.4% | 11.7% |

DIRECTIONS
For questions 15 to 21, use the following codes:

1. No
2. Yes

15. I would work in a high priority location if the amount of the stipend was increased.

No 57.5% Yes 42.5%

16. I would work in a high priority location if the condition of good attendance was not a factor in determining who received the incentive.

No 63.0% Yes 37.0%

17. I would work in a high priority location if the condition of satisfactory ratings by one's supervisor was not a factor in determining who received the incentive.

No 73.8% Yes 26.2%

18. I would work in a high priority location if the general working conditions were improved.

No 40.4% Yes 59.6%

19. I would work in a high priority location if the student discipline problems were reduced.

No 36.3% Yes 63.7%

20. I would work in a high priority location if I could teach students with higher test scores.

No 65.2% Yes 34.8%

21. I <u>would work</u> in a high priority location if administrative/teacher relations were improved.

No 46.6% Yes 53.4%

The School Board of Dade County, Florida adheres to a policy of nondiscrimination in educational programs/activities and employment and strives affirmatively to provide equal opportunity for all as required by:

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended - prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 - prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex.

Age Discrimination Act of 1967, as amended - prohibits discrimination on the basis of age between 40 and 70.

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 - prohibits discrimination against the handicapped.

Florida Educational Equity Act - prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, sex, national origin, marital status or handicap against a student or employee.

Veterans are provided re-employment rights in accordance with P.L. 93–508 (Federal) and Section 295.07, Florida Statutes, which also stipulates categorical preferences for employment.